



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,368	09/11/2003	Brian N. Belanger	2222.3810000	3018
26111	7590	01/07/2011	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.			JOINSON, CARLTON	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2436	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/659,368	BELANGER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CARLTON V. JOHNSON	2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-38 and 41-44 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-38 and 41-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-941)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to application amendments filed on 10-18-2010.
2. Claims **1 - 38, 41 - 44** are pending. Claims **1 - 5, 7 - 11, 13, 15 - 18, 20, 24, 29, 30, 32** have been amended. Claims **39, 40** have been cancelled. Claims **1, 7, 15, 16, 23, 24, 29, 30** are independent. This application was filed 9-11-2003.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's additional arguments have been fully considered but they were not persuasive.
 - 3.1 The Specification Objection is withdrawn due to addition of term *non-transitory computer-readable medium* to the specification.
 - 3.2 The 112 rejection for Claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 16 is withdrawn based on Applicant's arguments.
 - 3.3 The 101 Rejections for Claims 30 - 36 is withdrawn due to the addition of the term *non-transitory* to computer-readable medium.
 - 3.4 Applicant argues, *for Claims 1, 16, 24, 29, 30: wherein the access candidate attributes are revisable based, at least in part, on a determination indicating that access to the first level is prohibited.*

Bacha discloses modifying access requirements. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a resolution authority with ability to update access control information) Timson discloses the usage of additional modules to determine access requirements after a first level of authorization (a second level of authorization). In any event, Bacha discloses that access requirements are modified even if the requirements are modified in an access list. The access requirements which control access to the document (resource) are still modified (or revised).

3.5 Applicant argues, *there is no teaching that Timson EM's permissions are revisable.*

Timson is not used to disclose this particular claim limitation (revisable access requirements). And, Moreh is also not used to disclose this particular claim limitation. Bacha is used to disclose the modification of access requirements. See Section 3.4.

3.6 Applicant argues, *Dependent Claims 2 - 4, 8 - 10, 14, 17 - 19, 25, 26, 31 - 33, 37, 38*

Independent claims 7, 16, 24 and 30 have similar limitations as independent claim 1. Responses to arguments for independent claim 1 answer arguments against independent claims 7, 16, 24 and 30. Arguments against dependent claims are answered by responses to independent claims.

3.7 Applicant argues, *Claim 15: attributes are revisable.*

Orsini is not used to disclose this particular claim limitation (revisable access requirements). The Office Action discloses the claim limitation(s) Orsini is used to reject.

3.8 Applicant argues, *Claim 23: forward the request for access to one or more identified data access controllers for evaluation*

Timson discloses the capability to determine access requirement(s) at different security levels. Timson discloses the capability to add additional modules used for determining access requirements. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules) And, Timson discloses the capability to forward request to these additional access requirement modules. (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. submit, forward request for processing); col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources to enable (i.e. grant) control access to data))

3.9 Applicant argues, *Dependent Claims 5, 6, 11 - 13, 20 - 22, 27, 28, 34 - 36, 41 - 44*
Arguments against dependent claims are answered by responses to independent claims.

3.10 Timson does disclose operating within a network environment and physical access to a computing system. (see Timson col 3, lines 2-4: network connection for communications for enabling module; col 6, lines 47-64: used in a network environment; server computer incorporated into a network configuration; access to secure areas (physical access to equipment such as computing system))

Without a successful authorization comparison (a match), access is not permitted. All of the required functions are disclosed by Timson as indicated in the accompanying citations. (see Timson col. 3, line 34 - col. 4, line 15: access information; request/response authorization information; comparison of candidate (authorization) information; authorization verification, or prohibition if verification not successful) The Examiner has evaluated Applicant's remarks (past and present) and has determined that the Applicant desires a third party to act as a resolution authority in performing an additional authentication service.

Timson discloses the capability to add additional authentication modules to the authentication procedures. These additional authentication modules can generate a hierarchical structure for the authentication process with access to the resolution authority performed as a last authentication process as per claim limitation. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: hierarchical authorization structure) The Timson and Moreh prior art combination discloses the usage of a resolution authority to provide an additional authentication services. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

The enabling module can grant permissions by writing permissions data to a module to make it an enabling module such as the resolution authority in Moreh.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 - 4, 7 - 10, 14, 16 - 19, 24 - 26, 29 - 33, 37, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Timson et al.** (US Patent No. 6,041,412) in view of **Moreh et al.** (US Patent No. 6,959,336) and further in view of **Bacha et al.** (US Patent No. 6,839,843).

Regarding Claims 1, 7, 24, 29, Timson discloses a method comprising:

- a) receiving, using a processing device, a first request, from a first sponsor of an access candidate, for access to a first security level in a computer network, wherein the first security level secures computational resources for accessing electronic data (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. request submitted and processed)) and
- c): granting, using the processing device, access to the first security level based on a determination indicating that access to the first level is not prohibited; (see Timson col. 3, lines 11-16: determine (i.e. comparing), enable (grant) access)

Furthermore, Timson discloses the following:

- d) receiving, using the processing device, a second request, from a second sponsor of the access candidate, for access to a second security level in the computer network in response to the granting of access to the first security level, wherein

the second security level secures the electronic data; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. request submitted and processed); col 3, lines 2-4: network connection for communications for enabling module; col 6, lines 47-64: used in a network environment; server computer incorporated into a network configuration)

- e) determining, using the processing device, whether attributes of the access candidate satisfy access requirements of the electronic data secured by the second security level; (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59: attributes; col. 3, lines 11-16: determine (i.e. comparing), enable access)

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Furthermore, Timson discloses for f): obtaining authorization for the second request if the access candidate attributes fail to satisfy the access requirement of the electronic data in response to a determination indicating that access to the second security level is prohibited; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing, resolution authority; col. 2, lines 50-59: attributes; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization))

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses for f): obtaining authorization for request from a resolution

authority; and for g): in response to obtaining the authorization from the resolution authority (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy)), granting the access candidate access to the second security level; (see Timson col. 4, lines 7-15: access enabled (i.e. granted) based on transmitted permission data)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose revising access requirements.

However, Bacha discloses:

b) determining, using the processing device, whether access candidate attributes satisfy access requirements of the resources, wherein the access candidate attributes are revisable based, at least in part, on a determination indicating that access to the first level is prohibited, (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a resolution authority with ability to update (or revise) access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for revising access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use richer

search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claims 2, 8, 17, 25, 31, Timson discloses the method of Claims 1, 8, 16, 24, 30, further comprising granting access to the second security level in response to a determination indicating that access by the access candidate is not prohibited. (see Timson col. 4, lines 7-11: access enabled (i.e. granted), not prohibited; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization))

Regarding Claims 3, 9, 18, 32, Timson discloses the method of Claims 1, 7, 16, 30, further comprising denying access to the second security level if denied the third request. (see Timson col. 3, lines 28-32; col. 4, lines 11-15: access denied)

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules) Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in

order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Regarding Claims 4, 10, 19, 26, 33, Timson discloses the method of Claims 1, 7, 16, 24, 30, wherein at least one of the access requirements of the resources and the access requirements of the electronic data are represented as part of a graphical display associated with the access candidate and accessed for display to a controller via a network. (see Timson col. 5, lines 26-35: display capability for user interface information; access permission information)

Regarding Claims 14, 37, Timson discloses the method of Claims 7, 30, wherein at least one of the request for physical access or the request for access to the electronic data is submitted by more than one sponsor of the access candidate. (see Timson col. 14, lines 13-20: request, 1st level security; col. 14, lines 25-35: request processing, 2nd level security)

Regarding Claim 16, Timson discloses a system for providing an access candidate access to secured electronic data, the system comprising:

- a) storage means for receiving and storing electronic data using a computer network; (see Timson col. 18, lines 9-12; col. 18, lines 18-21: storage capability for accessible data)

Furthermore, Timson discloses the following:

- c) means for granting access to the one or more resources if the first comparison indicates that access is not prohibited; (see Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software means; col. 4, lines 7-11: access enabled (i.e. granted))
- d) means for evaluating a second request for access to the electronic data by the one or more resources, wherein an evaluation of the second request includes a second comparison of one or more attributes of the access candidate with one or more access requirements associated with the electronic data; (see Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software means; col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources to access and manipulate data)
- e) means for obtaining authorization for the second request, if the one or more attributes of the access candidate fails to satisfy one or more access requirements associated with the electronic data in response to the evaluation of the second request indicating that access to the electronic data is prohibited; (see Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software means; col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing, must be authorized (not prohibited) to access data) and
- f) means for granting access to the electronic data using the one or more resources in response to obtaining the authorization. (see Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software means; col. 3, lines 28-32; col. 4, lines 11-15: access enabled (i.e. granted))

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services. However, Moreh discloses obtaining the authorization from the resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in order to permit users and service providers the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Furthermore, Timson discloses for b): means for evaluating a first request for access to the one or more resources, in the computer network, wherein the resources secure the electronic data, and wherein an evaluation of the first request includes a first comparison of one or more attributes of the access candidate with one or more access requirements associated with the resources; (see Timson col. 5, lines 5-13: software means; col. 2, lines 50-59: attributes; col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing, evaluation to enable access)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose revising access requirements.

However, Bacha discloses:

b) wherein the one or more attributes of the access candidate are revisable if the first comparison indicates that access is prohibited; (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a resolution authority with ability to update

access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for revising access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 30, Timson discloses an article of manufacture including a non-transitory computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon, execution of which causes a processing device to perform operations comprising:

- a) receiving, using a processing device, a request for access to a first security level in a computer network; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40: request processing (i.e. submitted and processed))

Furthermore, Timson disclose the following:

- c) granting, using the processing device, access to the first security level based on a comparison indicating that access by the access candidate to the first security level is not prohibited; (see Timson col. 14, lines 13-20: 1st security level processing)
- d) receiving, using the processing device, a request for access to a second security level in the computer network; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. submitted and processed)) and

d) obtaining authorization for the request in response to a comparison indicating that access by the access candidate is prohibited,. (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing; col. 14, lines 25-35: 2nd security level processing; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization))

Furthermore, Timson discloses the generation of a hierarchical structure for access determination such as additional authorization modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: hierarchical authorization structure)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses obtaining authorization from a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh in order to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose modifying access requirements. However, Bacha discloses modifies one or more access requirements associated with second security level. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user

such as a resolution authority with ability to update access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for modifying access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 38, Timson discloses the method as in claim 1, further comprising determining the authorization by granting a waiver of the access requirements. (see Timson col. 4, lines 44-56: permission attributes for records are changeable; col 10, lines 37-45: generation of access permissions, data modules)

6. Claims 5, 6, 11 - 13, 15, 20 - 23, 27, 28, 34 - 36, 41 - 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Timson-Moreh-Bacha** and further in view of **Orsini et al.** (US PGPUB No. **20040049687**).

Regarding Claims 5, 11, 13, 27, Timson discloses the method of Claims 1, 7, 24, wherein the access requirements. (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59; col. 2, lines 41-49: attributes, permissions; col. 3, lines 34-40: required to access resources) Timson does not specifically disclose the access requirements comprise a citizenship status of the access candidate or a current location of the access candidate. However, Orsini discloses wherein at least one of access requirements of the resource

and the access requirements of the electronic data comprise a citizenship status of the access candidate or a current location of the access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for one or more access requirements related to at least one of a citizenship status of the access candidate and a current location of the access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claims 6, 12, 22, 28, 36, Timson discloses the method of Claims 5, 11, 16, 27, 30, wherein the one or more attributes of the access candidate. (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59: permissions, attributes for requestor (i.e. access candidate); col. 3, lines 34-40: required to access resources)

Timson does not specifically disclose attributes comprise a citizenship status of the access candidate or a current location of the access candidate.

However, Orsini discloses wherein one or more attributes of the access candidate relate to the at least one of a citizenship status of the access candidate or a current location of the access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for attributes comprise a citizenship status of the access candidate or a current location of the access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claim 15, Timson discloses a method comprising:

- a) identifying, using a processing device, a plurality of data subsets of the electronic data, wherein respective data subsets correspond to respective sets of access requirements; (see Timson col. 6 lines 43-46; multiple data sets and data records (i.e. a plurality of datasets))

Furthermore, Timson disclose the following:

- e) granting, using the processing device, access to the first security level based on a determination indicating that access to the first security level is not prohibited: ((see Timson col. 14, lines 13-20: request, 1st level security)
- g) determining, using the processing device, whether attributes of the access candidate satisfy the respective set of access requirements corresponding to the at least one of the plurality of data subsets; (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59: attributes; col. 3, lines 11-16: determine (i.e. comparing), enable access)
- i) in response to obtaining the authorization granting access to the second security level. (see Timson col. 14, lines 25-35: request, 2nd level security; col. 4, lines 7-

11: access enabled (i.e. granted))

Furthermore, Timson discloses

for b): determining, using the processing device, at least one data class associated with the respective data subsets (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-59: one data class or attributes of a class), and

for c): receiving, using the processing device, a first request, from a first sponsor of the access candidate, for access to a first security level in a computer network, wherein the first security level secures physical access to a computer workstation for accessing the electronic data, (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40: request processing; col. 2, lines 56-59; col. 17, lines 4-11: country attribute, requestor attributes; col. 14, lines 13-20: request, 1st level security), and

for f): receiving, using the processing device, a second request, a second sponsor of the access candidate, for access to a second security level in the computer network in response to the granting of access to the first security level, wherein the second security level secures access to at least one of the plurality of data subsets; (see Timson col. 14, lines 25-35: request, 2nd level security; col. 3, lines 34-40: permissions required to access data; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization))

Furthermore, Timson discloses for h): obtaining authorization for the second request if the access candidate attributes fail to satisfy the respective set of access

requirements corresponding to the at least one of the plurality of data subsets in response to a determination indicating that access to the at least one of the plurality of data subsets is prohibited. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Timson does not specifically disclose obtaining authorization from a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses for h): obtaining authorization from a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Orsini to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose an indication of a citizenship status of the access candidate, an indication of a current location of the access candidate, and an indication of an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate.

However, Orsini discloses the following:

b) at least a citizenship requirement and a location requirement for access to data associated with the at lease one data class; (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines

1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

- c) an indication of a citizenship status of the access candidate, an indication of a current location of the access candidate, and an indication of an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate; (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information, citizenship information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for the request including an indication of a citizenship status of the access candidate, an indication of a current location of the access candidate, and an indication of an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Timson-Moreh-Orsini does not specifically disclose revising access requirements. However, Bacha discloses: for d): determining, using the processing device, whether the access candidate attributes satisfy access requirements of the first security level, wherein the access candidate attributes are revisable based, at least in part, on a determination indicating that access to the first security level is prohibited; (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a resolution authority with ability to update access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-
Moreh-Orsini for revising access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of ordinary
skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to
improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use
richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 20, Timson discloses the system of Claim 16, wherein one or more
access requirements. (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request
processing; col. 2, lines 56-59; col. 17, lines 4-11: country information, attributes)
Timson does not specifically disclose at least one of: a valid data access agreement
with a potential access candidate; a current location of the potential access candidate;
and a citizenship status of the potential access candidate.
However, Orsini discloses wherein at least one of the one or more access requirements
associated with the resources and the one or more access requirements associated
with the electronic data relates to at least one of: a valid data access agreement with a
potential access candidate; a current location of the potential access candidate; and a
citizenship status of the potential access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines
1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e.
attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for at
least one of: a valid data access agreement with a potential access candidate; a current
location of the potential access candidate; and a citizenship status of the potential

access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claims 21, 34, 35, Timson discloses the system of Claims 20, 30, 34, wherein attributes of the access candidate. (see Timson col. 2, lines 50-56: attributes; col. 2, lines 56-59; col. 17, lines 4-11: country attribute, resource access) Timson does not specifically disclose at least one of: an indication of an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate; a current location of the access candidate; and a citizenship status of the access candidate.

However, Orsini discloses wherein at least one of: an indication an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate; a current location of the access candidate; or a citizenship status of the access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson for at least one of: an indication an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate; a current location of the access candidate; and a citizenship status of the access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph

[0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claim 23, Timson discloses a system comprising:

- a) storage configured to receive and store the electronic data using a computer network; (see Timson col. 18, lines 9-12; col. 18, lines 18-21: storage capability, data, information)

Furthermore, Timson disclose the following:

- b) one or more resources configured to process and manipulate the electronic data using a computer network; (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources to process and manipulate data)
- e) adapted to authorize access to one or more portions of the electronic data in response to a comparison performed by a corresponding data access controller indicates access is prohibited; (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources (i.e. resolution authorities) to control access and manipulate data; col. 3, lines 34-40: authorization required to access data; col. 4, lines 7-11: access determination (comparison, match) required for access (i.e. prohibited without authorization)) and
- f) a data access module configured to: evaluate a request for access to one or more portions of the electronic data by the one or more resources to identify one or more data access controllers corresponding to the one or more portions of the electronic data; (see Timson col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing; col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling

modules, resources (i.e. controllers) to enable (i.e. grant) access to data)) and
g) forward the request for access to the one or more identified data access
controllers for evaluation as to whether to grant the access candidate access to
the corresponding one or more portions of the electronic data. (see Timson col.
3, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 57-64: request processing (i.e. submit, forward
request for processing); col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and
enabling modules, resources to enable (i.e. grant) control access to data))

Furthermore, Timson discloses wherein one or more data access controllers
configured to grant access to a corresponding portion of the electronic data based at
least in part on a comparison, and associated with one or more resources or data
classes of the corresponding portion of the electronic data. (see Timson col. 2,
lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules, resources to
access and manipulate data; col. 4, lines 7-11: access enabled (i.e. granted))

Furthermore, Timson discloses access determination using additional authorization
modules. (see Timson col 4, line 60 - col. 5, line 4: additional authorization modules)

Timson does not specifically disclose a resolution authority or a 3rd party providing
authentication services.

However, Moreh discloses a resolution authority. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 48-62; col.
5, line 56 - col. 6, line 19: authentication services between client and server using
intermediate entity (protocol proxy))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson

to use authentication services such as a resolution authority as taught by Moreh.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Moreh to permit users and service provides the flexibility of choosing where to authenticate. (see Moreh col. 2, lines 44-46)

Timson-Moreh does not specifically disclose a citizenship status, a current location of the access candidate and an existence of a data access agreement with a citizenship requirement, location requirement and data access agreement requirement.

However, Orsini discloses the following:

- c) a citizenship status and a current location of the access candidate and an existence of a data access agreement with a citizenship requirement, wherein the location requirement and the data access agreement requirement; (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)
- d) the citizenship status and the current location of the access candidate with a citizenship requirement and a location requirement; (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for at least one of: an indication an existence of a data access agreement with the access candidate; a current location of the access candidate; and a citizenship status of the access candidate as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill

in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Timson-Moreh-Orsini does not specifically disclose modifying access requirements. However, Bacha discloses configured to modify the one or more access requirements. (see Bacha col. 10, lines 48-60: another authorized user such as a resolution authority with ability to update access control information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh-Orsini for modifying access requirements as taught by Bacha. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bacha to improve system efficiency by centralization of user access information and to use richer search parameters. (see Bacha col. 3, lines 18-24)

Regarding Claim 41, Timson discloses the method of claim 1. (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules to control access and manipulate data; col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 4, lines 7-11: authorization required to access data)

Timson does not specifically disclose for supplemental evidence to verify the attributes. However, Orsini discloses receiving supplemental evidence verifying the attributes of the access candidate. (see Orsini paragraph [0013], lines 1-3; paragraph [0060], lines 4-13: management of secure data, parameters (i.e. attributes) agreement, location information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Timson-Moreh for supplemental evidence such as current location to verify the attributes as taught by Orsini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Orsini for a relatively fast, secure, and efficient authentication of data streams. (see Orsini paragraph [0012], lines 1-3; paragraph [0013], lines 1-3)

Regarding Claim 42, Timson discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the data subsets are separated into the at least one data class based on a data provider of the data (see Timson col. 2, lines 31-34; col. 2, lines 40-41: interrogatable and enabling modules to control access and manipulate data; col. 3, lines 34-40; col. 4, lines 7-11: authorization required to access data; col. 2, lines 50-59: one data class or attributes of a class; financial and banking information (data provider))

Regarding Claim 43, Timson discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the physical access comprises physical access to a facility housing the computer workstation. (see Timson col 5, lines 31-35: access to computer monitor display (login); col 6, lines 47-64; col 10, lines 51-59)

Regarding Claim 44, Timson discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the physical access comprises logging on to the computer workstation. (see Timson col 5, lines 31-35: access to computer monitor display (login); col 6, lines 47-64)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Carlton V. Johnson
Examiner
Art Unit 2436

CVJ
December 20, 2010

/Nasser Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436